

Male and Female EFL Learners' Self-Perceived Strategy Use across Various Educational Levels: A Case Study

Abdorrezza Tahriri (Corresponding author)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities, University of Guilan, PO box 41635-3988, Rasht, Iran

Tel: 98-131-669-0274 (ext. 4053) E-mail: atahriri@gmail.com

Hoda Divsar

Department of English Language, Payame Noor University, PO box 19395-3697, Tehran, Iran

Tel: 98-132-782-5992 E-mail: hodadivsar@gmail.com

Received: May 30, 2011

Accepted: June 28, 2011

Published: December 1, 2011

doi:10.5539/elt.v4n4p181

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n4p181>

Abstract

This study sought to explore the role of language learning strategies (LLSs) in Iran as an EFL context. The major objective was to find out the strategy use of Iranian EFL learners and the possible influence of their educational level and gender on their reported strategy use. Ninety-seven EFL undergraduates studying at Payame Noor University of Guilan participated in the study. A self-reported inventory, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, was used to determine the participants' perceived strategy use. The findings revealed that the participating EFL learners were medium strategy users irrespective of their gender and educational level. The reported LLSs which had the highest frequency were metacognitive, compensation, social, and cognitive strategies respectively. Memory and affective strategies were found to be the least frequent ones. The results of the ANOVA indicated that the differences between the educational levels were significant for metacognitive strategy use only. Except for the observed difference between sophomores and juniors, the differences between sophomores *and* seniors and juniors *and* seniors were statistically significant. Furthermore, gender differences were not found to be statistically significant. The results of the study highlight the significance of LLSs and also confirm that educational level is a determining factor in strategy use.

Keywords: Language Learning strategies, Gender, Level, EFL, Case study

1. Introduction

The 'good language learner' studies pioneered by Rubin (1975) originated the impetus for exploring the function and role of language learning strategies (LLSs) more extensively. In addition, the emergence of language teaching methods such as Learning Strategy Training which focused on instructing the language learners to employ strategies in their learning highlighted the significance of LLSs. Since then, there has been a growing interest in discovering the effective and productive learning strategies. The explosion of interest in learning strategies over the last three decades or so can be identified in the seminal works of scholars such as Oxford (1990) and O'Malley and Chamot (1990) who contributed to the growth of this interest significantly. Burgeoning attention paid to LLSs and the factors that influence their use in recent years is the result of the view that regards learning as a process and the role of the teacher as the facilitator of that process. This is the consequence of the shift of focus from product-oriented view to process-oriented view to language instruction in recent decades.

There is now a paucity of research examining EFL learners' preferred strategy use. The present study is an attempt to explore male and female EFL learners' perceived use of LLSs across various educational levels. The growing corpus of literature in this area continues to capture attention; however, there is little solid knowledge concerning the role of strategy use in EFL contexts. A lingering question is whether or not strategy use relates to one's educational level and gender. A pertinent factor relates to the role of context as a potentially determining factor, the role of which should be taken into consideration.

Ellis (1994) defined strategy as "mental or behavioral activity related to some specific stage in the overall process of language acquisition or language use" (p. 529). Strategy has a dual interpretation in the literature. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) stated that strategies could be perceived of as *behavioral* as stated by Oxford (1990), as *mental*, or

both. In the former case, it is *observable*, and the latter case reveals that it is *difficult to be observed*.

LLSs have been analyzed in different ways. For example, Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) used observation to analyze the strategies. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) utilized first language categories while Oxford's (1990) classification of LLSs is a multi-source one which draws on various factors. Chamot and El-Dinary (1999) and Chamot et al. (1996) also employed think-aloud protocol to analyze learning strategies.

Oxford (1990) defined LLSs as "operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information" (p. 8). O'Malley and Chamot (1990) also defined them as the skills that are acquired as declarative knowledge which would subsequently become procedural as a result of extensive practice. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified LLSs into three types: metacognitive (knowing about learning and controlling learning through planning, monitoring and evaluating learning activity), cognitive (manipulation or transformation of the material to be learned) and social/affective (involving the learner in communicative interaction with another person, for example, collaboration with peers and teachers in the learning process). Oxford (1990) divided the LLSs into two broad categories of direct and indirect dichotomy. Direct learning strategies consist of memory (creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing action), cognitive (practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output) and compensation strategies (guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing). Indirect strategies consist of metacognitive (centering, arranging and planning, and evaluating your learning), affective (lowering your anxiety, encouraging yourself, and taking your emotional temperature), and social strategies (asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others).

1.1 Statement of the problem

Having a better understanding of the role of LLSs requires an examination of the role of the potential variables which are associated with them in one way or another. To develop a more comprehensive view towards the role and influence of LLSs, the interrelationships of strategies with learner factors such as gender and educational level need to be established. In fact, the role of context is usually ignored in many relevant studies and the findings are overgeneralized to other contexts to make universal claims. This study seeks to investigate the role of LLSs in Iran as an EFL context. The study aims at examining how Iranian EFL learners use LLSs and whether or not the reported use is affected by their educational level and gender.

1.2 Significance of the study

Investigating the use of LLSs will allow us to make more informed decisions concerning how they should be taught in language classes. In fact, a preliminary step in any educational planning is gaining accurate information with regard to the present situation. Studies on LLSs will make the planning stage more flexible to incorporate the learners' characteristics into consideration prior to the implementation stage.

There is currently a paucity of research concerning the role of LLSs in various contexts. The majority of studies conducted so far are limited to ESL context. In fact, the results obtained from studies in ESL context might not be necessarily similar to those conducted in EFL ones. Moreover, previous studies are predominantly concerned with the role of these strategies and have not sought to investigate their relationship to other variables such as instructional level and gender. There is a need to increase our understanding of how the perceived use of LLSs is related to educational level and gender of EFL learners. As such, we will be able to tailor our strategy instruction to males and females at different levels in order to enhance the quality and effectiveness of language instruction.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The major objective of the study is to shed light on the role of LLSs in Payame Noor University of Guilan as an EFL context. The role of educational level and gender are also taken into consideration as moderator variables. In other words, the study aims at determining how students at Payame Noor University of Guilan as a specific setting where the study was carried out employ LLSs. In addition, another objective is to determine if the strategy use varies across various educational levels.

2. Literature Review

Numerous studies have shown the significance of LLSs in making language learning more efficient (Wenden & Rubin, 1987; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1996; Cohen, 1998). In what follows, the major studies are reviewed in chronological order.

Mochizuki (1999) carried out a study in a state-run university in central Japan. The objectives of the study were to determine the type of strategies that Japanese university students use and the factors that influence their choice of strategies. The participants of the study were 44 second-year students and 113 first-year students in 1996. The

findings of the study revealed that Japanese university students use compensation strategies most often. Affective strategies were found to be the least frequently used ones. Most proficient students used cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently than less proficient ones. The study also found that choice of strategies was influenced by factors such as major, motivation and gender of the participants.

Riazi and Rahimi (2005) investigated Iranian EFL learners' perceived use of LLSs based on Oxford's (1990) classification which consists of the six strategy categories (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social). Two hundred and twenty female and male English major university students took part in this study. The results of the study revealed that Iranian EFL learners were medium strategy users overall. However, metacognitive strategies were used with a high frequency. For cognitive, compensation, and affective strategies, a medium frequency was reported and memory and social strategies were found to be of low frequency.

Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) investigated the LLS use of 55 ESL students who enrolled in a college Intensive English Program (IEP). The relationship between LLS use and second language proficiency was also examined in this study with a focus on differences in strategy use across gender and nationality. The IEP is in fact "a language learning institute for pre-admissions university ESL students, and is an important step in developing not only students' basic Interpersonal Communications Skills (BICS), but more importantly their Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)" (p. 399). The participants had differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was utilized to collect the data. A curvilinear relationship between strategy use and English proficiency was found. The findings revealed that students in the intermediate level used learning strategies more than beginning and advanced levels. More strategic learners were found to advance along the proficiency continuum faster than less strategic language learners. The researchers also found that the participants preferred using metacognitive strategies most whereas the use of affective and memory strategies were found to be the least. As for the gender differences, females preferred to employ affective and social strategies more frequently than their male counterparts.

Lau (2006) sought to investigate the differences between Chinese good and poor readers concerning their strategy use. The participants of the study were eight grade 7 students in Hong Kong, four good readers and four poor readers. The participants received a think-aloud task and an interview. The findings revealed that Chinese good readers utilized more strategies and had better ability and awareness of strategy use than did poor readers who participated in this study. The poor readers had poorer intrinsic motivation than the good readers in addition to the cognitive deficiencies. They were unwilling to process the text at a deeper level due to the combined problems of poor reading ability and motivation and they simply gave up when they encountered reading difficulties.

Zhang and Goh (2006) investigated 278 Singaporean students' knowledge and use of 40 listening and speaking strategies, and the correlation between these two factors. Use-focused and form-focused learning strategies, comprehension strategies and communication strategies were distinguished in this study. The results of the study showed that the participants believed in the usefulness of all four groups of strategies under investigation. However, they seemed more frequently to use use-focused strategies. Half of the participants considered thirty two strategies as useful whereas only 13 strategies were reported as used frequently. This discrepancy indicated that the participating students were aware of the usefulness of the strategies. However, they could not be considered as conscious and confident strategy users. A need was felt to increase their repertoire of strategies. Perceptions of the usefulness and perceived use of the strategies were positively correlated.

Riazi (2007) examined the patterns of language learning strategy use among 120 female Arabic-speaking students majoring in English at a university in Qatar. To tap the perceived strategy use, the SILL (ESL/EFL Student Version) was utilized. The findings of the study revealed that Arab EFL learners tended to be medium strategy users bordering on high strategy users. The order of reported strategy categories was metacognitive, cognitive, compensation, social, memory and affective strategies respectively. In addition, the findings indicated that freshmen were the highest rate of strategy users. Except for compensation strategies, no significant difference was found among four educational levels with regard to the use of strategy categories.

Jinag and Smith (2009) indicated that a better understanding of Chinese learners' strategy use could be obtained through accessing their own voices, and by analyzing the findings with respect to historical context. This study was an interview-based one which examined the strategy use of 13 English language learners from three generations of learning experience. The analysis of the findings confirmed that memorization could be considered as a popular learning strategy for these learners. However, the application of this learning strategy was argued to be complex and diverse "while change as well as continuity emerges from an overall comparison of different generations' learning strategy use" (p. 286). The researchers argued that language policy and related pedagogy might exert significant influences.

Lai (2009) examined LLSs used by 418 EFL learners in Taiwan to determine the relationships between LLS use and the patterns of strategy use based on language proficiency. The most frequently used strategies were compensation strategies and affective strategies were the least frequent strategies. The most frequently used individual strategies consisted of guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations in using English. The least used individual items were speaking and writing to others. The results also showed that proficiency level had a significant effect on strategy choice and use. In fact, the more proficient learners utilized more LLSs. Metacognitive strategies and cognitive strategies were used most frequently and memory strategies least frequently by more proficient learners. On the other hand, the less proficient learners preferred social and memory strategies to cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The findings also indicated that the more frequently strategies used by the more proficient learners were arranging and planning one's learning, using analytical and reasoning skills and practicing one's pronunciation and speaking.

A study by Yu and Wang (2009) was concerned with the LLS use of Chinese EFL secondary school students in Northeast China from the perspective of socio-cultural theory. Quantitative and qualitative methods were both utilized in this research. The results revealed that Chinese secondary school EFL learners utilized memory and cognitive strategies more than other types of strategies. Semi-structured interviews also showed that Chinese EFL learner strategy use was greatly influenced by the learning context, classroom practice and assessment. The researchers argue that the classroom practice currently in use in China and assessment methods do not help the EFL learners develop communicative competence and autonomous learning. They also strongly recommend that teaching be communication-oriented and student-centered in the implementation of the new English pedagogy in China.

Tsai, Ernst and Talley (2010) conducted a study to determine the relationship between L1 (Mandarin Chinese) and L2 (English) strategy use in L2 reading comprehension with a focus on the correlation of L1 reading ability, L2 proficiency and reading strategies. The participants of the study were 222 EFL undergraduates. They were grouped into skilled and less-skilled groups. Almost no difference of strategy use was confirmed between skilled and less-skilled readers in reading L1 material. However, the results confirmed that skilled readers use more strategies in L2 to improve their comprehension than less-skilled readers.

To sum up, several studies point to the importance of LLSs in language instruction (Zhang & Goh, 2006; Jinag & Smith, 2009). In the EFL contexts, language learners were mostly found to be medium strategy users and sometimes bordering on high strategy users (Riazi & Rahimi, 2005; Riazi, 2007).

The present study was driven by four research questions:

1. What is the perceived use of LLSs by English majors at Payame Noor University of Guilan?
2. What are the LLSs most frequently used by male and female English majors at Payame Noor University of Guilan?
3. What is the relationship between the participants' self-reported strategy use and their educational level (sophomores, juniors and seniors)?
4. What is the relationship between the participants' gender and their self-reported strategy use?

3. The Study

In what follows, the participants of the study along with the instrument and data collection and analysis procedures are explained.

3.1 Participants

Ninety-seven EFL undergraduates studying at Payame Noor University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran participated in the present study. There were 32 sophomores, 33 juniors, and 32 seniors. The mean age of the participating EFL learners was 22.01. Since the researchers did not have access to enough number of freshmen, the study was limited to other three levels. In terms of their gender, there were 30 males and 67 females in this study.

3.2 Instrument

A self-reported inventory, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (ESL/EFL Version) developed by Oxford (1990), was used to determine the participants' perceived strategy use (see Appendix A). The SILL is a 50-question, self-rating survey for EFL learners. It examines the frequency of the strategy usage for L2 learning. SILL has six sections including memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social each of which aims at measuring one strategy type in particular. The scoring procedure of the inventory is given in Table 1.

According to Ellis (1994), Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies is the most comprehensive classification. The SILL has undergone significant revisions and has been translated into numerous languages, with

multiple reliability and validity checks performed (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, the present researchers ran Alpha Cronbach reliability analysis through SPSS 17.0. The reliability analysis revealed a coefficient of .807 which is indicative of the relatively high reliability of the questionnaire.

3.3 Data collection and data analysis procedures

The researchers distributed the SILL questionnaire among the participants in their class hour. The participants were first briefed about the purpose of the study and they were instructed to complete the questionnaire as prescribed. Meanwhile, the anonymity of the participating students was guaranteed.

The collected data were subjected to descriptive statistics based on Oxford's (1990) rating scheme for LLSs. The participants' responses to the items of the questionnaire were coded and analyzed for the pattern of strategy use. To determine the strategy use of the participants, descriptive statistics was used. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also run to determine the differences among male and female students at various educational levels in terms of their perceived strategy use.

4. Findings and Results

To determine the participants' perceived strategy use, Oxford's (1990) rating scheme as presented in Table 1 was utilized. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the participants' responses to the SILL items. Based on Oxford's (1990) rating scheme, the mean range of 2.5 to 3.4 means that the learners sometimes use strategies and they are labeled as 'medium strategy users'. As Table 2 reveals, the participants of the study are medium strategy users overall. The reported strategies which have the highest frequency are metacognitive, compensation, social, and cognitive strategies respectively. Memory and affective strategies are the least frequent ones.

In Table 3, the perceived strategy use is given for male and female participants of the study for each strategy type. Table 3 reveals that male participants use cognitive, affective and compensation strategies more frequently. With regard to other strategy types, males and females are found to be very similar to each other.

Another variable under investigation is the educational level of the EFL learners. Table 4 summarizes the perceived strategy use of the participants at three educational levels under investigation. In terms of memory strategy, sophomores reported a slightly higher strategy use. Juniors tended to utilize more cognitive strategies. In addition, sophomores and juniors used more compensation strategies compared to their senior counterparts. In terms of metacognitive strategy use, juniors were the highest level followed by sophomores. Juniors were also higher than the participants at other two levels in terms of affective and social strategy use.

To ensure the statistical significances of the differences between male and female sophomore, junior and senior participants, ANOVA was run using SPSS 17.0. Table 5 shows the result of ANOVA for male and female participants. The result of ANOVA reveals that the differences between males and females are not statistically significant. As indicated in Table 5, all significance levels are higher than 0.5 (critical level of alpha).

Table 6 shows the results of ANOVA for the differences in participants' responses in terms of their educational level. As Table 6 shows, the differences between levels are significant for metacognitive strategy use only. For other types of strategy use, the difference is not statistically significant.

Post Hoc Scheffe test was run to determine the levels which are different from each other. Table 7 shows the result of the Post Hoc Scheffe test which shows the differences of the various levels in terms of metacognitive strategy use. Except for the difference between *sophomores and juniors*, the differences between *sophomores and seniors* and *juniors and seniors* are found to be statistically significant.

5. Conclusions

The first research question addresses the perceived use of LLSs by English majors. The present study reveals that the EFL learners under investigation are medium strategy users irrespective of their gender and educational level. This means that they *sometimes* use LLSs. This finding is line with the finding of Riazi and Rahimi (2005) who also found that EFL learners were medium strategy users.

The second research question is concerned with the LLSs most frequently used by male and female English majors. The reported LLSs which have the highest frequency are metacognitive, compensation, social, and cognitive strategies respectively. Memory and affective strategies are the least frequent ones. This finding partially confirms the findings of the study by Riazi and Rahimi (2005). In both studies, metacognitive strategies are found to have the highest frequency. However, in the present study, social strategies have a higher frequency compared to what is indicated by Riazi and Rahimi (2005). In the study by Lai (2009), affective strategies were the least frequent strategies. This finding is also confirmed by the present research. Also, in Riazi's (2007) study, Arabic-speaking

students majoring in English reported their perceived LLS use in the order of metacognitive, cognitive, compensation, social, memory, and affective respectively which is roughly in line with the findings of the present study.

With regard to the relationship between the participants' self-reported strategy use and their educational level, sophomores report a slightly higher use of memory strategy. However, juniors tend to employ more cognitive strategies whereas sophomores and juniors utilize more compensation strategies compared to their senior participants. Concerning metacognitive strategy use, juniors are found to be the highest followed by sophomores. In addition, in terms of affective and social strategy use, juniors are higher than their sophomore and senior counterparts. However, the result of ANOVA reveals that the differences between levels are significant for metacognitive strategy use only. Except for the difference between *sophomores* and *juniors*, the differences between *sophomores* and *seniors* and *juniors* and *seniors* are statistically significant. These findings confirm those of Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) who found a curvilinear relationship between strategy use and English proficiency. Their study revealed that students in the intermediate level tended to use learning strategies more than beginning and advanced levels. In the present study, the average strategy use of juniors is almost higher than their sophomores and senior counterparts.

As for the relationship between the participants' gender and their self-reported strategy use, male EFL learners report a higher degree of strategy use in terms of cognitive, compensation and affective strategies. This is contrary to Hong-Nam and Leavell's (2006) study who found that females preferred to employ affective and social strategies more frequently than male learners. However, the result of ANOVA shows that gender differences are not statistically significant.

To sum up, this study highlight the significance of LLSs and also confirm that educational level is a determining factor in strategy use. Gender is also found to play a role although inferential statistics (ANOVA) does not confirm the role of gender conclusively. These findings are of significant pedagogical significance. The EFL instructors can make use of the findings of the present study and gear their strategy instruction toward students at various educational levels in order to maximize the efficiency of strategy use.

References

- Chamot, A. U., & El-Dinary, P. B. (1999). Children's learning strategies in language immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 319-338
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jinag, X., & Smith, R. (2009). Chinese learners' strategy use in historical perspective: A cross-generational interview-based study. *System*, 37(2), 286-299. (Eric Reproduction Service Number: EJ 839260)
- Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34(3), 399-415
- Lai, Y. (2009). Language learning strategy use and English proficiency of university Freshmen in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 255-280
- Lau, K. (2006). Reading strategy use between Chinese good and poor readers: A think-aloud study. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 29(4), 383-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2006.00302.x>
- Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese university students. **RELC Journal**, 30, 101-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368829903000206>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. *System*, 23(2), 153-17. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(94\)00047-A](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(94)00047-A)
- Riazi, A. (2007). Language learning strategy use: Perceptions of female Arab English majors. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 433-440. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02868.x>
- Riazi, A., & Rahimi, M. (2005). Iranian EFL learners' pattern of language learning strategy use. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 2, 103-129

- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586011>
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 304-318
- Tsai, Y., Ernst, C., & Talley, P. C. (2010). L1 and L2 strategy use in reading comprehension of Chinese EFL readers. *Reading Psychology*, 31(1), 1-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02702710802412081>
- Yu, Y., & Wang, B. (2009). A study of language learning Strategy use in the context of EFL curriculum and pedagogy reform in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(4), 457-468. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188790903309041>
- Zhang, D., & Goh, C. (2006). Strategy knowledge and perceived strategy use: Singaporean students' awareness of listening and speaking strategies. *Language Awareness*, 15(3), 199-219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/la342>
- Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.)*. New York: Macmillan. pp. 315-327
- Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (eds.) (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. UK: Prentice Hall.

Table 1. Key to Scoring the SILL

High	Always or almost always used.	4.5 to 5.0
	Usually used.	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes used.	2.5 to 3.4
	Generally not used.	1.5 to 2.4
Low	Never or almost never used.	1.0 to 1.4

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics: The SILL

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory	97	1.33	4.33	2.8069	.54797
Cognitive	97	1.70	4.28	3.1966	.60100
Compensation	97	1.50	5.00	3.2392	.68774
Metacognitive	97	1.00	5.00	3.7244	.78294
Affective	97	1.00	4.66	2.9933	.74889
Social	97	1.66	5.00	3.2269	.88230

Table 3. Strategy Use of Male and Female Participants

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory	<i>Male</i>	30	2.8010	.57217
	<i>Female</i>	67	2.8096	.54119
Cognitive	<i>Male</i>	30	3.1330	.65698
	<i>Female</i>	67	3.2251	.57712
Compensation	<i>Male</i>	30	3.3010	.59340
	<i>Female</i>	67	3.2115	.72853
Metacognitive	<i>Male</i>	30	3.7473	.96786
	<i>Female</i>	67	3.7142	.69260
Affective	<i>Male</i>	30	3.0803	.76412
	<i>Female</i>	67	2.9543	.74446
Social	<i>Male</i>	30	3.2183	1.08724
	<i>Female</i>	67	3.2307	.78285

Table 4. Strategy Use across Three Educational Levels

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
Memory	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	2.8937	.64088	1.55	3.88
	<i>Junior</i>	33	2.7921	.34805	2.11	3.66
	<i>Senior</i>	32	2.7353	.61708	1.33	4.33
	Total	97	2.8069	.54797	1.33	4.33
Cognitive	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	3.2422	.66734	1.85	4.28
	<i>Junior</i>	33	3.3406	.43602	2.28	4.14
	<i>Senior</i>	32	3.0025	.64331	1.70	4.28
	Total	97	3.1966	.60100	1.70	4.28
Compensation	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	3.3306	.74380	1.83	5.00
	<i>Junior</i>	33	3.3300	.51624	1.83	4.33
	<i>Senior</i>	32	3.0541	.76396	1.50	4.33
	Total	97	3.2392	.68774	1.50	5.00
Metacognitive	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	3.8337	.78499	2.55	5.00

	<i>Junior</i>	33	4.0655	.53901	3.00	4.88
	<i>Senior</i>	32	3.2634	.79165	1.00	4.44
	Total	97	3.7244	.78294	1.00	5.00
Affective	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	3.0641	.77579	1.00	4.16
	<i>Junior</i>	33	3.1221	.75617	1.83	4.66
	<i>Senior</i>	32	2.7897	.69213	1.50	4.00
	Total	97	2.9933	.74889	1.00	4.66
Social	<i>Sophomore</i>	32	3.2372	1.02330	1.66	5.00
	<i>Junior</i>	33	3.4309	.85155	2.16	4.83
	<i>Senior</i>	32	3.0062	.72137	1.66	4.33
	Total	97	3.2269	.88230	1.66	5.00

Table 5. ANOVA (Gender Effect)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.005	.944
	Within Groups	28.825	95	.303		
	Total	28.826	96			
Cognitive	Between Groups	.176	1	.176	.484	.488
	Within Groups	34.499	95	.363		
	Total	34.675	96			
Compensation	Between Groups	.166	1	.166	.349	.556
	Within Groups	45.241	95	.476		
	Total	45.407	96			
Metacognitive	Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.037	.848
	Within Groups	58.825	95	.619		
	Total	58.848	96			
Affective	Between Groups	.329	1	.329	.584	.447
	Within Groups	53.511	95	.563		
	Total	53.840	96			
Social	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.004	.949
	Within Groups	74.729	95	.787		
	Total	74.732	96			

Table 6. ANOVA (Level Effect)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	Between Groups	.413	2	.206	.682	.508
	Within Groups	28.413	94	.302		
	Total	28.826	96			
Cognitive	Between Groups	1.956	2	.978	2.810	.065
	Within Groups	32.719	94	.348		
	Total	34.675	96			
Compensation	Between Groups	1.636	2	.818	1.757	.178
	Within Groups	43.771	94	.466		
	Total	45.407	96			
Metacognitive	Between Groups	11.021	2	5.510	10.830	.000*
	Within Groups	47.827	94	.509		
	Total	58.848	96			
Affective	Between Groups	2.035	2	1.017	1.846	.164
	Within Groups	51.805	94	.551		
	Total	53.840	96			
Social	Between Groups	2.935	2	1.467	1.921	.152
	Within Groups	71.797	94	.764		
	Total	74.732	96			

Table 7. Post Hoc Scheffe Test

(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<i>Sophomore</i>	Junior	-.23170	.17697	.428	-.6719	.2085
	Senior	.57031*	.17833	.008	.1268	1.0139
<i>Junior</i>	Sophomore	.23170	.17697	.428	-.2085	.6719
	Senior	.80202*	.17697	.000	.3618	1.2422
<i>Senior</i>	Sophomore	-.57031*	.17833	.008	-1.0139	-.1268
	Junior	-.80202*	.17697	.000	-1.2422	-.3618

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Appendix A: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

This form of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate Worksheet (page 4), write the response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) that tells How True of you the statement is.

1 = Never or almost never true of me 2 = Usually not true of me 3 = Somewhat true of me
4 = Usually true of me 5 = Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.
USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.
SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.
USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.
ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate Worksheet. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete.

- Answer 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 (as described above).

Part A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part B

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
14. I start conversations in English.
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.

25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

Part E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

Part F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

Appendix B: پرسشنامه راهبردهای یادگیری آکسفورد

این نسخه از پرسشنامه راهبردهای یادگیری آکسفورد برای فراگیران زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان دوم یا زبان خارجی است. در زیر 50 عبارت درباره فراگیری زبان انگلیسی مشاهده می کنید. لطفاً هر عبارت را به دقت بخوانید و در کنار شماره مربوط به هر عبارت، یکی از اعداد 1، 2، 3، 4، یا 5 را که نشان می دهد هر عبارت در مورد شما چقدر صدق می کند درج نمایید.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 = هیچ وقت یا تقریباً هرگز | (بسیار به ندرت صحیح است) |
| 2 = معمولاً در مورد من صحیح نیست. | (صحیح در کم تر از پنجاه درصد موارد) |
| 3 = تا حدودی در مورد من صدق می کند. | (صحیح در حدود پنجاه درصد موارد) |
| 4 = معمولاً در مورد من درست است. | (صحیح در بیشتر از پنجاه درصد موارد) |
| 5 = همیشه یا تقریباً همیشه در مورد من صحیح است | (تقریباً همیشه صحیح است) |

برحسب این که هر عبارت، چقدر توصیف کننده شماست پاسخ دهید نه بر اساس این که فکر می کنید که چگونه باید باشید یا دیگران چگونه اند. این عبارت ها هیچ پاسخ درست یا غلط ندارد. با ملاحظه و به سرعت پاسخ دهید. زمان معمول برای پاسخ گویی حدود 20 تا 30 دقیقه است. پاسخ شما

یکی از اعداد 1، 2، 3، 4، یا 5 باشد.

بخش اول

1. به روابط بین آن چه از قبل می دانم و چیزهای جدیدی که به زبان انگلیسی یاد می گیرم فکر می کنم.
2. کلمات جدید انگلیسی را در جمله به کار می برم تا آن ها را به یاد بسپارم.
3. صدای یک کلمه جدید انگلیسی و تصویر یا شکل آن کلمه را به هم ربط می دهم تا در به خاطر سپاری کلمه به من کمک کند.
4. یک کلمه جدید انگلیسی را با ایجاد یک تصویر ذهنی از موقعیتی که آن کلمه را می توان در آن به کار برد به خاطر می سپارم.
5. از قافیه برای به خاطر سپاری کلمات جدید انگلیسی استفاده می کنم.
6. از "فلش کارد" برای به خاطر سپاری کلمات جدید انگلیسی استفاده می کنم.
7. کلمات جدید انگلیسی را با حرکت بدن، اجرا می کنم.
8. دروس انگلیسی را اغلب مرور می کنم.
9. کلمات یا عبارات جدید انگلیسی را با به خاطر سپردن جای آن ها در صفحه، روی تابلوی کلاس، یا در تابلوهای راهنمایی و رانندگی به خاطر می سپارم.

بخش دوم

10. کلمات جدید انگلیسی را چندین بار بیان می کنم یا می نویسم.
11. تلاش می کنم تا مانند انگلیسی زبان ها صحبت کنم.
12. اصوات انگلیسی را تمرین می کنم.
13. کلمات انگلیسی ای را که بلدم به شیوه های مختلف به کار می برم.
14. گفت و گو ها را به زبان انگلیسی آغاز می کنم.
15. کلیپ های تلویزیونی به زبان انگلیسی را تماشا می کنم یا فیلم به زبان انگلیسی می بینم.
16. برای لذت بردن، به زبان انگلیسی مطلب می خوانم.
17. یادداشت، پیام، نامه یا گزارش به انگلیسی می نویسم.
18. ابتدا یک متن انگلیسی را به سرعت می خوانم. سپس بر می گردم و با دقت آن را می خوانم.
19. به دنبال کلماتی در زبان مادری ام می گردم که شبیه کلمات جدید انگلیسی باشند.
20. تلاش می کنم در زبان انگلیسی، الگوها یا قالب های زبانی بیابم.
21. معنای یک کلمه انگلیسی را با تقسیم آن کلمه به اجزای آن که می شناسم، پیدا می کنم.
22. سعی می کنم کلمه به کلمه ترجمه نکنم.
23. اطلاعاتی را که به زبان انگلیسی می شنوم یا می خوانم خلاصه می کنم.

بخش سوم

24. برای فهمیدن کلمات انگلیسی ناآشنا، از حدس زدن استفاده می کنم.
25. زمانی که در حین مکالمه، کلمه ای به یاد نمی آید، از حرکات بدن استفاده می کنم.
26. اگر کلمات درست را در انگلیسی بلد نباشم، کلمات جدیدی می سازم.
27. بدون این که هر کلمه جدیدی را در فرهنگ لغت پیدا کنم، متون انگلیسی را می خوانم.
28. سعی می کنم حدس بزنم که یک فرد در ادامه سخنش به زبان انگلیسی چه خواهد گفت.
29. اگر یک کلمه انگلیسی به یادم نیاید، از کلمه یا عبارتی که معنی مشابه دارد استفاده می کنم.

بخش چهارم

30. سعی می‌کنم به هر شیوه‌ای که می‌توانم، زبان انگلیسی را به کار ببرم.
31. متوجه اشتباهاتم در زبان انگلیسی می‌شوم و از این اطلاعات استفاده می‌کنم تا عملکرد بهتری داشته باشم.
32. حواسم معطوف به صحبت کسی است که به زبان انگلیسی صحبت می‌کند.
33. سعی می‌کنم پی ببرم چطور می‌توانم یادگیرنده زبان بهتری باشم.
34. برنامه‌های زمانی خود را طوری طرح ریزی می‌کنم تا وقت کافی برای مطالعه انگلیسی داشته باشم.
35. دنبال افرادی می‌گردم که با آن‌ها بتوانم به انگلیسی صحبت کنم.
36. دنبال فرصت‌هایی می‌گردم که تا حد ممکن به انگلیسی مطلب بخوانم.
37. اهداف روشنی برای بهبود مهارت‌های انگلیسی خود دارم.
38. به پیشرفت خودم در یادگیری زبان انگلیسی، فکر می‌کنم.

بخش پنجم

39. هر وقت از به کار بردن زبان انگلیسی دچار واهمه شدم، سعی می‌کنم چند لحظه استراحت کنم.
40. خودم را تشویق می‌کنم تا حتی زمانی که از اشتباه کردن می‌ترسم، انگلیسی صحبت کنم.
41. زمانی که در انگلیسی عملکرد خوبی دارم، به خودم پاداش می‌دهم.
42. در زمان مطالعه یا استفاده از زبان انگلیسی، اگر هیجان زده یا عصبی شوم، متوجه می‌شوم.
43. احساسات خود را در دفتر یادداشت‌های روزانه مربوط به یادگیری زبان، می‌نویسم.
44. با فرد دیگری درباره این که در زمان یادگیری زبان چه احساسی دارم، حرف می‌زنم.

بخش ششم

45. اگر مطلبی را به زبان انگلیسی متوجه نشوم، از گوینده می‌خواهم آرام‌تر صحبت کند یا آن مطلب را دوباره بگوید.
46. از گویشوران انگلیسی می‌خواهم تا اشتباهاتم را در حین صحبت تصحیح کنند.
47. با سایر فراگیران زبان (دانشجویان)، انگلیسی تمرین می‌کنم.
48. از گویشوران زبان انگلیسی درخواست کمک می‌کنم.
49. به زبان انگلیسی، سوال می‌پرسم.
50. سعی می‌کنم درباره فرهنگ انگلیسی زبان‌ها، بیاموزم.